

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-12, 14, 16 and 22-25 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. The Office Action rejects claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments obviate the grounds for the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-25 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,173 to Ubillos. The Office Action further rejects claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ubillos and U.S. Patent No. 6,469,711 to Foreman et al. (hereafter "Foreman"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Ubillos does not disclose every claimed feature as required under 35 U.S.C. §102. For example, Applicant respectfully submits Ubillos fails to disclose at least features of a multi-level position/range designating method including (a) displaying an entire first range of a multimedia stream, and (b) setting a second range designated by a user, and (c) concurrently displaying the entire first range and the entire second range, wherein the displayed first and second ranges are the same size and combinations thereof as recited. Further, Applicant respectfully submits Ubillos does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of displaying and setting,

wherein each level and sublevel maintains the same temporal reference frame period and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Foreman does not teach or suggest at least features of claim 1 lacking from Ubillos. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Ubillos and Foreman, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of concurrently displaying the entire first range and the entire second range, wherein the displayed first and second ranges are the same size and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 9, 14, 22 and 24 define patentable subject matter for least reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-21, 23 and 25, depend from claims 1, 9, 14, 22 and 24, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as their additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 and 20-25 under §102 and claims 18-19 under §103 is respectfully requested.

C. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments to the independent claims 1, 9, 14, 22 and 24 are for clarity and do not narrow the scope of the claims under Festo.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Serial No. 09/703,608
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2004

Docket No. CIT/K-0132

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carl R. Wesolowski, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/CRW;jld
Date: September 28, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610